

Summary of Telephone Interview with Examiner on 05/22/07.

Applicants thank Examiner for the telephone interview extended to their attorney, J. B. Kraft on May 22, 2007. As Applicants set forth in that interview, the claims have been amended to specifically cover Applicants' preferred embodiment. Thus, representative claim 8 has been amended to include all of the elements of cancelled claims 9, 10, 11, and 14. Accordingly, amended claim 8 should be considered as rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Tu (US2004/0027391) in view of Kay (US7,146,404).

Applicants submitted that this combination does not suggest the method of amended claim 8 wherein the authorization to alternate Web documents is determined by the IP address of a business organization employees on a private internal network connected to the Web.

The Kay reference does not appear to determine access to Web documents based upon the address of the employee on an internal business organization network connected to the Web. Kay teaches determining access to a service such as instant messaging service based upon screen name of employee/user.

REMARKS

Amendment to the claims

The claims have been amended to limit the claimed invention to Applicants' preferred embodiment wherein the same hyperlink in a received Web document when selected by a user will access either a publicly accessible Web document from a business organization, or if the user, identified by his IP address, is an authorized employee of the business organization, then an alternate Web document with protected business data on an internal network of the business connected to the Web will be accessible to the identified employee.

To this end, independent claim 1 has been amended to include all of the elements of cancelled claims 2-4, and 7, and independent claims 8 has been amended to include all of the elements of cancelled 9-11 and 14.

Also claims 21-25 have been cancelled.

In order to rewrite the computer program claims so as to put these claims in better form, and to cover an invention corresponding in scope to the amended system and method claims, computer program claims 15-20 have been cancelled and rewritten as new claims 26 and 27.

Accordingly, it is submitted that remaining amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-13, and 26-27 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Tu (US2004/0027391) in view of Kay (US7,146,404). Tu does not teach the same hyperlink in a received Web document when selected by a user will access either a publicly accessible Web document from a business organization, or if the user, identified by his IP address, is an authorized employee of the business organization, then an alternate Web document with protected business data on an internal network of

business connected to the Web will be accessible to the identified employee.

The Kay patent does not make up for these deficiencies of Tu. Kay essentially teaches the general concept of limiting services available to groups or classes of individuals. As an example, the patent does disclose that an employer may limit instant messaging networks to only employees. This does not suggest the business concept of the present claimed invention or suggest that Tu may be modified to provide a business organization offering a Web link with two alternative Web pages: one for the general and the other for identified authorized employees accessible through an internal private business network.

The rejection of dependent claims 5 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Tu (US2004/0027391) in view of Hastings (US6,370,629) is also respectfully traversed. Dependent claims 5 and 12 have all of the elements of their respective independent claims, and in addition set forth that a determination as to the accessibility of alternative Web may be geographical as determined by requesting address location. Even if Hastings may be said to disclose access to stored data may be determined by requesting location, claims 5 and 12 remain unobvious based upon the distinctions set forth above for the patentability of their respective independent claims.

PATENT
10/660,009

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-13, and 26-27 are now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Kraft 5/23/07
J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

ALL CORRESPONDENCE SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO:

Greg Doudnikoff
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
IBM Corporation, BLDG YXSA/B002
3039 Cornwallis Rd.
P.O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2195